

The Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board (CEAB) is inviting comments from accreditation stakeholders on the following proposed changes to the *Interpretive Statement on Licensure* (Appendix 3 CEAB Accreditation Criteria and Procedures):

Current wording (2019 Accreditation Criteria)	Proposed wording
8. In order to ensure that engineering science,	8. Engineering science, engineering design,
mathematics and complementary studies	complementary studies curriculum content
curriculum contents are readily and easily	should be readily and easily identifiable in each
identifiable, each course in an engineering	course where they appear.
program should be described using a maximum	
of three curriculum categories (ES, ED, NS,	
Math, CS) with no single category constituting	
less than 8 AU's or 25% of the total AU for a	
particular course.	
9. It is up to the institution offering the program	9. For any course having one or more curriculum
to justify the unique aspects of any course that	categories (ES, ED, NS, Math, CS) constituting less
deviates from clause 8.	than 10% of the total AU count, the institution
	should ensure that sufficient course materials are
	available to support the AU distribution.

The proposed changes are in response to stakeholder feedback that the restrictions on AU distributions:

- Do not support modern pedagogy in engineering programs which promotes integration of multiple concepts across learning activities throughout the curriculum, and
- Are an impediment to curriculum reform and the continual improvement process.

The predicted impact of these changes is minimal and is expected to be of benefit to the stakeholders of the CEAB accreditation system. The proposed wording requires that curriculum content be readily and easily identifiable and that the institutions be prepared to make evidence available to visiting teams that supports the program's reported AU distribution.

## Key questions asked of stakeholders:

- 1. Do the proposed changes to clauses 8 and 9 of the *Interpretive Statement on Licensure* support modern pedagogy in engineering programs?
- 2. Will the proposed changes to clauses 8 and 9 of the *Interpretive Statement on Licensure* impede the CEAB's ability to assess the curriculum contents of an engineering program?
- 3. Do the recommendations affect your level of confidence in the established accreditation process?
- 4. What are the ramifications, both positive and negative, of implementing the recommendations? What risks might be incurred by this implementation? How can these risks be mitigated?

## Who should participate?

The CEAB has identified higher education institutions, members of Engineering Deans Canada (EDC), engineering regulators' councils, boards of examiners, and/or academic review committees as potential participants in this process. However, other interested parties are invited to provide feedback on the proposal.

The CEAB invites interested parties to submit their written responses to these questions by January 29, 2021. Written responses should be directed to <u>accreditation@engineerscanada.ca</u> or by mail to:

Interpretive Statement on Licensure Consultation c/o Mya Warken Engineers Canada 300-55 Metcalfe St. Ottawa, ON K1P 6L5

Written responses must be received by January 29, 2021.